

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/748,190	12/31/2003	Toshiyuki Ogata	Q77760	5536	
	7590 03/07/2007 ION, ZINN, MACPEAK	EXAMINER			
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.			ZIMMER, MARC S		
Washington, DC 20037			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1712		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			03/07/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)
10/748,190	OGATA ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit
Marc S. Zimmer	1712

	Marc S. Zimmer	1712	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the d	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>08 February 2007</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS.		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of ving replies: (1) an amendment, aff tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in o	Appeal. To avoid aba idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire a Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 70 Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exit under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE D6.07(f). on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply original than three months after the mailing da	g date of the final rejecting FIRST REPLY WAS FIRST FIRST REPLY WAS FIRST FI	on. ILED WITHIN te extension fee ate extension fee ce action: or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	ns of the date of e appeal. Since
AMENDMENTS		•	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, I (a) They raise new issues that would require further con(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belon(c) They are not deemed to place the application in beto.	nsideration and/or search (see NO` w);	TE below);	
appeal; and/or	ter form for appear by materially re	ducing or simplifying	ine issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally rej	ected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21 See attached Notice of Non-Co	mnliant Amendment	(PTOL_324)
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)			(F10£-324).
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).	lowable if submitted in a separate,	timely filed amendme	nt canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will vided below or appended.	ll be entered and an e	explanation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1 and 8.			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	t before or on the date of filing a No d sufficient reasons why the affidav	otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> it or other evidence is	t be entered necessary and
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appear and was not earlier presented. So	al and/or appellant fai ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	ls to providé a).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ed.
 The request for reconsideration has been considered bu <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 	t does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowar	ice because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).		
13. Other:	man	RC 6 ZIMMER	
	MAI PRIM	RCS ZIMMER ARY EXAMINER	

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Examiner has already acknowledged that, while Lin teaches a copolymer CONSISTING OF p-hydroxybenzylsilsesquioxane units and phenylsilsesquioxane units, there is no express indication as to what ratio of these units is favored, which is why the rejection has been stated under 35 U.S.C. 103. Howeverm the Examiner maintains that this aspect is obvious in view of the rationale outlined previously. As to the notion that Applicant overcomes a holding of obviousness with a show of unexpected results with their presentation of the results of Example 1 and Comparative Example, there a a plurality of differences between the polymers described in these Examples thus making it impossible to ascertain to what the better performance of the polymer of Example 1 should be attributed. For instance, whereas Example 1 describes a polymer containing only the units permitted by claims 1 and 8, the polymer of the comparative example features a contribution from a third type of repeating unit. The polymers also differ in that the ratio of the phenylsilsesquioxane and hydroxybenzylsilsesquioxane are not the same. With more than one variable distinguishing the polymers of these examples, the Examiner cannot know which of these parameters is icausing a different outcome to be observed. Furthermore, this comparison hardly shows that the endpoints of the two types of unit being 5:5...